



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/504,236	02/15/2000	Swain W. Porter	112076-138321	7611

25943 7590 04/03/2006

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

88

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/504,236		PORTER, SWAIN W.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Kristie Shingles		2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 12-20, 24, 26-29, 31-38, 41-46 and 48-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 12-20, 24, 26-29, 31-38, 41-46 and 48-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Per Applicant's Request for Continued Examination:

*Applicant has amended claims 1, 24, 26, 27 and 59-61.
Claims 7-11, 21-23, 25, 30, 39, 40 and 47 have been cancelled.
Claims 62-71 are new.*

Claims 1-6, 12-20, 24, 26-29, 31-38, 41-46 and 48-71 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/9/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 24, 28, 33, 35, 41, 45, 50, 52, 56 and 59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2141

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. **Claims 1-6, 12-16, 20, 24, 26-29, 31, 32, 41-46, 48, 49 and 56-71** are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *Gabber et al* (US 5,961,593).

a. **Per claim 1**, *Gabber et al* teach a method comprising:

- a user computer providing a first email address received from an email service provider for use to register a user of the user computer with a first web site (col.12 lines 1-26);
- the user computer providing a second email address received from the email service provider, separate and distinct from the first email address, for use to register said user with a second web site (col.12 lines 1-44);
- wherein first and second email addresses were simultaneously provided to the user computer by the email service provider in advance of providing the first and second email addresses to the first and second web sites by the user computer (col.7 lines 4-24, col.10 lines 4-40).

b. **Claims 28, 41, 45, 56, 59, 62 and 67** contain limitations that are substantially

equivalent to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 24**, *Gabber et al* teach a method comprising:

- an electronic device requesting and receiving for a user, a first email address from an email service provider at a first point in time subsequent to the user subscribing for email service with the email service provider (col.12 lines 4-7);
- the electronic device employing the received first email address to facilitate communication between the user and a first communication partner or group of communication partners (col.12 lines 1-26);
- the electronic device, prior to the first communication partner or group of communication partners initiating a communication with the user, notifying the email service provider of said employment of the first email address to facilitate communication with the first communication partner or group of communication partners (col.7 lines 34-39, col.13 lines 27-53, col.15 lines 8-15);

Art Unit: 2141

- the electronic device requesting and receiving for the user, a second email address, separate and distinct from said first email address, from the email service provider at a second point in time subsequent to the user subscribing for email service with the email service provider, the second point in time being a later point in time than the first point in time (col.7 lines 4-24, col.10 lines 4-40);
- the electronic device employing the received second email address to facilitate communication between the user and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (col.12 lines 1-44); and
- the electronic device, prior to the second communication partner or group of communication partners initiating a communication with the user, notifying the email service provider of said employment of the second email address to facilitate communication with the second communication partner or group of communication partners (col.7 lines 34-39, col.13 lines 27-53, col.15 lines 8-15).

d. **Per claim 2, *Gabber et al*** teach the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user identifier (col.8 lines 25-30 and 43-47, col.10 lines 4-40, col.12 lines 1-44).

e. **Per claim 3, *Gabber et al*** teach the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises an address of the email service provider, and the second email address comprises the address of the same email service provider (col.10 lines 4-9).

f. **Per claim 4, *Gabber et al*** teach the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises a first user identifier and an address of the email service provider, and the second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user identifier, and the address of the same email service provider (col.10 lines 4-29).

g. **Per claim 5, *Gabber et al*** teach the method of claim 1, wherein said providing of the first and second email addresses by the user computer comprises selecting by said first and

Art Unit: 2141

second email address from a plurality of distinct email addresses simultaneously provided by said email service provider to said user computer (col.8 lines 25-31).

h. **Per claim 6**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 5, wherein the method further comprises the user computer obtaining the distinct email addresses from the email service provider in advance of the selection (col.8 lines 25-31).

i. **Per claim 12**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 1, wherein the method further comprises the user computer notifying the email service provider of the usage of the first and second email addresses, including addresses of the first and the second web site (col.7 lines 34-39, col.13 lines 27-53, col.15 lines 8-15).

j. **Claims 31, 32, 42, 48, 49, 58 and 61** are substantially similar to claim 12 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

k. **Per claim 13**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 12, wherein said notifications are performed integrally as said first and second email addresses are respectively provided to said user computer for use to respectively register the user with first and second web sites (col.7 lines 34-39, col.13 lines 27-53, col.15 lines 8-15).

l. **Claims 26 and 43** are substantially similar to claim 13 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

m. **Per claim 14**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 12, wherein said notifications are performed subsequently in batch after said first and second email addresses were provided to said user for use to register the user with the first and the second web sites (col.7 lines 34-39, col.13 lines 27-53, col.15 lines 8-15).

n. **Claims 27 and 44** are substantially similar to claim 14 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

o. **Per claim 15**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 1, wherein the method further comprises: receiving emails addresses to said first and second email; organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first of the second email address (col.12 lines 19-44).

p. **Per claim 16**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 15, wherein said organizing of said received emails is at least further based on whether said received emails addressed to said first or second email address were sent respectively by said first or second web site or not (col.12 lines 19-44).

q. **Claims 64, 65, 69 and 70** are substantially similar to claims 15 and 16 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

r. **Per claim 20**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 1, wherein the web site is a content provider, a service provider and an access provider (col.5 lines 30-34).

s. **Per claim 29**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 28, wherein said simultaneously providing comprises the email service provider providing a plurality of other distinct email addresses to the electronic device (col.7 lines 4-24, col.8 lines 58-60, col.10 lines 4-40).

t. **Per claim 46**, *Gabber et al* teach the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide a plurality of distinct email addresses to the electronic device used by the user in advance of the first and second email addresses' initial selection for usage, for the electronic device to select said first and second

Art Unit: 2141

separate and distinct email addresses (col.7 lines 4-24, col.8 lines 58-60, col.10 lines 4-40, col.12 lines 1-44).

u. **Claims 57 and 60** are substantially similar to claims 5 and 46 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

v. **Per claim 63**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 62, further comprising: sending information to the email service provider relating the first email address to the first intended communication partner or partners and the second email address to the second intended communication partner or partners (col.7 lines 4-24, col.8 lines 58-60, col.10 lines 4-40, col.12 lines 1-44).

w. **Claim 68** is substantially similar to claim 63 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

x. **Per claim 66**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 62, further comprising: generating and sending a request to the email service provider to return a set of email addresses including a plurality of distinct email addresses (Abstract, col.9 line 62-col.10 line 29).

y. **Claim 71** is substantially similar to claim 63 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 33-35 and 50-52** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gabber et al* (US 5,961,593) in view of *Pennell et al* (US 6,874,023).

a. **Per claim 33**, *Gabber et al* teach a method comprising: an email service provider receiving emails addressed to a first and second email address of a user, the first and second email addresses having been provided by the email service provider to an electronic device of the user for the electronic device to facilitate respective communication between the user and a first and a second intended communication partner (col.10 lines 4-40).

Gabber et al teach the providing separate mailboxes for each of the user-substitute email address allowing the user to dispose of unwanted messages from third-party websites (col.12 lines 26-32). Yet *Gabber et al* fail to explicitly teach email server provider organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses of the user, and respective intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses of the user. However *Pennell et al* teach the email server provider organizing the received emails based on the distinct email addresses of users and allowing for the user to designate with are wanted or unwanted (Figure 6, col.3 lines 53-65, col.4 lines 35-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Gabber et al* with *Pennell et al* for the purpose of organizing email messages according to the user's different email addresses and presenting the email messages of interest to the user, wherein the user can bypass reading messages from parties of no interest.

b. **Claims 35, 50 and 52** contain limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 33 are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 34**, *Gabber et al* and *Pennell et al* teach the method of claim 33, *Pennell et al* wherein said organizing of said received emails is at least further based on whether said received emails addressed to said first or second email address were sent respectively by said first or second web site or not (Figure 6, col.3 lines 53-65, col.4 lines 35-43).

d. **Claim 51** is substantially equivalent to claim 34 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

7. **Claims 17-19, 36-38 and 53-55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gabber et al* (US 5,961,593) in view of *Kamiya et al* (USPN 5,923,845).

a. **Per claim 17**, *Gabber et al* teach the method of claim 16, *Gabber et al* teach the selective disposal of email messages sent from the third-party websites (col.12 lines 29-32). Yet *Gabber et al* fail to explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises deleting all received emails addressed to said first or second email addresses not sent respectively by said first or second web site, while preserving all undeleted emails addresses to said first or second email addresses sent respectively by said first or second web site.

However, *Kamiya et al* teach deleting all received emails addressed to said first/second email addresses not sent by said first or second web site, while preserving all undeleted emails addressed to said first/second email addresses sent by said first or second web site (col.4 lines 3-10, col.9 lines 38-51, col.17 lines 24-30). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of *Gabber et al* by deleting all received emails not sent by said first or second web site

because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

b. **Claims 36 and 53** are substantially similar to claim 17 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 18**, *Gabber et al* and *Kamiya et al* teach the method of claim 17, *Kamiya et al* further teach wherein said bifurcated deletion is performed in response to an instruction of said user (col.17 lines 24-30).

d. **Claims 37 and 54** are substantially similar to claim 18 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

e. **Per claim 19**, *Kamiya et al* teach the method of claim 18, wherein the method further comprises providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said deletion instruction with a single press of a key or control button (col.17 lines 24-30, col.23 lines 23-28).

f. **Claims 38 and 55** are substantially similar to claim 19 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Oseto (6,097,797), Rochkind (6,161,129), Gabber et al (6,591,291), Bates (6,314,439), Agraharam et al (6,085,231) and (5,987,508).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.


Art Unit: 2141

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

kds



LEWISTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER